

Defending the Defenseless

Americans Who Opposed the Mistreatment of Germans following World War II

[Kerry R. Bolton](#)

Despite the Germanophobia that was drummed up even prior to the USA's 1941 entry into the war against Germany, the immediate aftermath saw a significant reaction of Americans to war crimes and post-war genocidal policies that were being inflicted on Germany. Several salient factors for this include: (1) the large component of the American population that is of German descent, (2) the "isolationist" tradition of American foreign policy upheld in the slogan and the pre-war mass movement of "America First," that resisted the campaign to push the USA into the war, (3) the affront to traditional honor and justice such actions and policies represented to many American military leaders and jurists of what might be termed the "old school," and (4) the realization that a strong, rather than a permanently impoverished and castrated, Germany was needed as an ally in the post-war world.

The USA had pursued a course of vengeance and pastoralization of conquered Germany via the Morgenthau Plan named after the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau Jr. The measures drafted by the Treasury Department, under the direction of Dr. Harry Dexter White (nee Weiss) aimed to reduce the German population by a policy of starvation, reminiscent of Lazar Kaganovich's contrived famine widely held to have caused the deaths of up to seven million Ukrainians and to have broken the *kulak* class of successful peasantry. That White was later exposed as a Soviet agent might suggest another motive for the Morgenthau Plan as pursuing quite another aim to that intended by Morgenthau et al who thought only in terms of Old Testament-type vengeance and total annihilation. Might the aim of White and other Soviet agents within U.S. Treasury have been to use the Morgenthau Plan dialectically, to push the Germans into the embrace of the USSR, whose policy, despite the mass rapes committed by soldiers of the Red Army, after the war became far more conciliatory towards Germans than France, Britain and the USA?[\[1\]](#)

A genocidal attitude towards Germany had long been harbored in influential U.S. circles. The Morgenthau Plan was enacted on a *de facto*, not a *de jure* basis. Hence, it could be, and still is, claimed that the "plan" was abortive. Ironically, Deborah Lipstadt, the "scholar" who is heralded as the vanguard of opposition to "Holocaust denial," a rhetorical term without scholarly meaning, denies there was a Morgenthau Plan[\[2\]](#) in the course of her largely *ad hominem* attack on those who question certain aspects of World War II "history."

Details of U.S. post-war policy in occupied Germany got back to the USA and aroused protest from the remnants of traditional America who spoke up against policies and actions that they viewed as an affront to justice. The extent to which there was an undercurrent of opposition to post-war policy among notable individuals of the Old America is best indicated by a compendium that was produced by an American of German descent. As I have related previously,[\[3\]](#) H. Keith Thompson Jr. established himself as a literary agent of significance despite his association with the pre-war German-American Bund and with the post-war Socialist Reich Party, and individuals such as Major General Otto Remer, Yockey, George Sylvester Viereck, Edward Fleckenstein, et al. Thompson compiled a volume of hundreds of testimonials from prominent figures throughout the world, who protested the treatment of the naval hero Grand Admiral Karl Dönitz and the very concept of "war crimes" trials of German military leaders.

These testimonials were presented to Dönitz upon his release from Spandau. Here we find among the Americans who criticized the treatment of Dönitz and other German military leaders, opposition to the dubious legal judicial foundations of the war crimes trials by Ohio Supreme Court Justice William L. Hart, who wrote the foreword, and cited the *Chicago Tribune* that “no one of the victors was free of guilt” of the accusations made against the Germany.[\[4\]](#)

Nuremberg Set Tyrannical Precedent

Hart and many others commented of Nuremberg that it set a dangerous precedent that should not be followed in future.[\[5\]](#) This is precisely one of the primary concerns of revisionists: how precedents set by the Allied treatment of Germany have established foundations for the present “new world [dis]order,” reflected for example in the lynching of Saddam Hussein and the trials of Serb military and political leaders. Again it is the concept of vengeance being played out behind the rhetoric of the concepts of “international law” established at Nuremberg. The epilogue from Rear Admiral Dan V. Gallery’s book *Twenty Million Tons under the Sea* was used as the “Prologue” for the Dönitz book, with Gallery’s permission, wherein he referred to “the kangaroo court at Nuremberg.” Its reference as the “International Military Tribunal” he regarded as “a libel on the military profession.”[\[6\]](#) He found it absurd that military leaders could be tried for waging “aggressive war.” Admirals Dönitz and Raeder were tried under new rules of war at sea that the Allies had not themselves followed.[\[7\]](#)

Another excerpted chapter is from John F. Kennedy’s book *Profiles in Courage*, where he lauds Senator Robert A. Taft, a Republican Party statesman who had campaigned to keep the USA out of World War II and continued to oppose US global adventurism after the war.[\[8\]](#) He had opposed *ex post facto* laws and continued to do so in regard to Nuremberg. Kennedy stated that such views were shared by many Americans, “at least privately,” and after, but the only politician of conscience to speak out was Taft.[\[9\]](#)

Taylor Caldwell, the novelist, was among those who regarded the “war crimes trials” as “barbaric” and stated that “our country’s hands are not free of blood and crime, in spite of our vaunted democracy and ‘noble aspirations,’ etc. etc., ad nauseam.” She regarded the trials as among the blackest of the USA’s “recent black (and Red) spots.”[\[10\]](#) Senator William Langer wrote to Dönitz that his conviction at Nuremberg was a “miscarriage of justice,” and that he had done nothing other than his duty.[\[11\]](#) Hon. J. Bracken Lee, Governor of Utah, regarded the Allies as “just as guilty” as those who were tried as “war criminals.”[\[12\]](#)

Lipstadt laments that “Holocaust deniers” and critiques of post-war Allied policy towards Germany focus on the Morgenthau Plan, which she correctly states “would have prevented the economic rehabilitation of Germany.” However she claims “the plan was never put into effect.”[\[13\]](#) *The Morgenthau Diary*, published in two volumes from a selection of thousands of documents edited by Professor Anthony Kubek of Dallas University, and issued by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate on the Judiciary in 1967, shows that Morgenthau and his chief assistant Dr. Harry Dexter White headed up a team in the U.S. Treasury that supervised the War and State Departments in formulating policies on occupied Germany. Drawing on the memoirs of Secretary of War Henry Stimson and Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Kubek asserts that Morgenthau and White, et al were at loggerheads with other policy-makers. Due to Morgenthau’s influence on Roosevelt it was the Treasury cabal that prevailed. Morgenthau also had the support of a perennial presidential adviser, the banker Bernard Baruch, who threatened to end the careers of those in Washington who stood in the way of obliterating Germany.[\[14\]](#) Stimson objected that the Morgenthau Plan to deindustrialize Germany would cause the

starvation of 30,000,000 Germans. Although President Truman opposed the Morgenthau Plan and Morgenthau resigned in 1945 when Truman did not include him in the Potsdam delegation, 140 of his Treasury cabal were ensconced in the occupation administration in Germany and ensured that genocidal policies proceeded under the terms of JCS 1067.^[15] The extent to which the Morgenthau Plan was carried out has been documented by Bacque.^[16]

What is objectionable to certain interests about those who expose Allied war crimes is that this is “relativizing” the Holocaust, an offense that has been considered previously in *Inconvenient History*.^[17] If German criminality in World War II was no more or less iniquitous than the wartime criminality of any other state, then the uniqueness of the Jewish experience is undermined. Hence also the moral underpinning of not only the Israeli State, but of the special taboo against criticizing any reprehensible character who happens to be Jewish. While Lipstadt et al claim that historical revisionism is devoid of *any* scholarly merit, they are stuck with the existence of genuinely eminent scholars such as Charles C. Tansill, professor of American diplomatic history at Georgetown University, who saw World War II as an inevitable consequence of the Versailles Treaty in his 1952 book *Back Door to War*,^[18] and Harry Elmer Barnes. Inconvenient historians such as Tansill and Barnes therefore do not have their scholarship scrutinized, but rather are portrayed as merely part of an anti-Semitic current that had its precursor with the Henry Ford-sponsored 1920s series “The International Jew.” published in the Ford Company’s newspaper *The Dearborn Independent*,^[19] and continued today by Klansmen and neo-Nazis. Hence, Tansill and Barnes become part of an anti-Semitic world conspiracy that includes tobacco-chewing Klansmen and Muslim suicide bombers. In this vein James J. Martin, another American scholar, is cited as having described the Morgenthau Plan as running Germany “according to the Old Testament instead of the New.”^[20]

Nuremberg Trials a Jewish Triumph

While those who point out that Allied occupation policy, including that of Morgenthau and of Nuremberg, seemed more like *Talmudic* than Western legalism are portrayed as “anti-Semites,” Jewish spokesmen boast of their role in conceptualizing vengeance as a modern war aim. Dr. Nahum Goldmann, who had headed several of the primary Zionist organizations, while president of the World Jewish Congress gave credit to the WJC as the organization from whose bowels “the war crimes trials” issued forth. The WJC, he stated, established the Institute of Jewish Affairs,

where the groundwork was laid for two objectives: ensuring that the Nazi criminals did not escape punishment and obtaining maximum restitution from a defeated Germany. It was in this Institute that the idea of punishing Nazi war criminals was first conceived, an idea later taken up by some great American jurists, notably Justice Robert H. Jackson of the Supreme Court, and implemented in the Nuremberg Trials. The idea of prosecuting and sentencing political and military leaders for crimes against humanity was completely new to international justice.”^[21]

Goldmann commented that many jurists opposed the trials because “they were unable to see beyond the concepts of conventional jurisprudence.” What Goldmann calls “concepts of conventional jurisprudence” are the concepts of law and justice built up over centuries by Western Civilization, based on the Christian ethos and chivalry. To jurists schooled in a countertradition, that of *Talmudic* dialectics, these are concepts that have no place in the world. Goldmann also points out that these concepts of jurisprudence are what have since formed the basis of “international law” in condemning vanquished statesmen and military leaders. National sovereignty, stated Goldmann, had to become subordinated to

this new concept of ‘international morality,’ as “an effective warning and deterrent for the future.”^[22] The concepts seem not to apply to the military and political leaders of Israel, which might be accounted for by the dual moral code of Judaism; or as it might be simply put: “do as I say, not as I do.” Goldmann stated that the WJC, under the direction of Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson, “put great effort into the intellectual and moral groundwork for these trials, and it is one of the triumphs of the Roosevelt administration that it consistently accepted these principles despite all the misgivings of some influential allies circles, particularly in England.”^[23] Can anything be clearer, or was Goldmann making empty boasts?

Early Misgivings

However, there were early misgivings about U.S. policies in Germany, which filtered back to the USA. While Lipstadt refers in passing in an endnote to one Karl Brandt in connection with the revisionist publisher Henry Regnery,^[24] she does not mention that he was professor of economics at Stanford University, who had returned from Germany where he had been an adviser to the US occupation government. He spoke before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, on the “draconian policies” of the USA that would destroy not only Germany but also all of Europe. Indeed, Brandt and a group of refugees from Hitler’s Germany sought to have Harper, the publisher of Henry Morgenthau’s book *Germany Is Our Problem*, publish a rebuttal that they would prepare. Harper refused to do so.

Regnery and a colleague published the rebuttal, which had the same title as the Morgenthau book, and detailed how Allied post war policies were destroying Europe. It was published at a very early post-war date – 1946, by Human Events Inc., for which Regnery was an editor. ^[25]

After publishing several pamphlets on the United Nations Charter and on the U.S. Constitution, Regnery produced a volume of letters that had been smuggled from Germany (Germans having been forbidden after the war to write abroad) “which gave a graphic picture of what life was like in that broken country.” As Regnery describes it, the first pamphlets that established him as a notable conservative publisher were on the condition of Germany and Allied policies. ^[26]

While according to Lipstadt the Morgenthau Plan was not happening, the eminent Jewish Left-wing publisher Victor Gollancz, founder of the influential Left Book Club, had returned to London from a visit to Germany. He wrote in letters to London newspapers of the British occupation zone where Germans were reduced to starvation, of the dismantling of industries, and the expulsion of refugees from their homes in the East, to overfill German cities such as Hamburg that had been reduced to rubble. Gollancz published these letters and other reports in two books, *In Darkest Germany*, and *Our Threatened Values*. Despite his prominence, Gollancz could not find a major American publisher, so his two books were offered for publication to Regnery.^[27] The Gollancz books were the first to be published by Henry Regnery Company.^[28] Oddly, Gollancz is missing from Lipstadt’s list of Holocaust deniers and relativists. *Our Threatened Values* had an important review in *Time*, describing Gollancz as “retaining his Jewish faith and socialist belief,” while stating that humanity’s salvation rests with the uniting of “traditional religious ethics” with Western secular beliefs, based on mercy, love and respect.

Gollancz related to Regnery in New York that after the war Churchill had asked him about the conditions in Germany, and claimed concern. He was also shocked by the killing of German civilians in the British air raids over Hamburg, Dresden, etc., claiming that he had not been told. Gollancz remarked to Regnery that of course Churchill had known, but a certain “romantic” ideal had enabled him after the war to

selectively forget by what we might see as rationalizing his self-image of innocence and virtue. Asking Gollancz whether it was true that 5,000 civilians had been obliterated at Hamburg, Gollancz remarked that the figure was much higher, and likewise perhaps more than 200,000 at Dresden because of the number of refugees cramming the cities. [29] (In recent years it has become customary to greatly scale down the figures, although orthodox academics and authors do not seem to be threatened in the same manner as those who question the sacred figure of 6,000,000). Gollancz soon became a champion of the Arabs displaced by Zionism.

Another early book published by Regnery was *Whither Germany* by Hans Zbinden, well-known in Switzerland as an author and a humanitarian. He asserted “the disappearance of Germany as a political and spiritual force would probably mean the end of European history.” This was followed by *From Versailles to Potsdam*, by Leonard von Muralt, professor of modern history at the University of Zürich, with the theme on the shortsightedness of basing the post-war world on the type of revenge that the Versailles *diktat* placed on Germany after World War I. These books began to get significant reviews in venues such as the *Saturday Review of Literature*. [30] In 1949 two other books on German policies were published by Regnery, Montgomery Belgion’s *Victor’s Justice*, on the war crimes trials; and *The High Cost of Vengeance* by Freda Utey, on Allied occupation policy. [31] Belgion was well-known in England as an essayist and literary critic who had served as an officer during the war. He regarded the war crimes trials as a travesty of Western justice, and that those sitting in judgment were also guilty of war crimes. While Germany was accused of using forced labor [albeit paid work with holidays home] while the trials were proceeding not only the USSR, but France and Britain were using forced labor [without pay and holidays home] with prisoners of war supplied by the USA. [32]

Freda Utey was an important figure in the post-war opposition to U.S. genocide against Germany. She contended in *The High Cost of Vengeance* that the USA came to Germany as a conquering “master race,” affirming rather than repudiating the doctrine of “might makes right.” [33] As one would expect, Lipstadt condemns Utey as among the “relativists and German apologists” who cited Allied war crimes as mitigating the Third Reich. Moreover, Utey became “one of the most vocal” of Senator Joseph McCarthy’s supporters, using tactics of Nazi apologists in condemning the mass transfer of German refugees from the Soviet-occupied East, [34] which caused many deaths of German displaced persons. Again, a background of this “Nazi apologist” and McCarthyite is not given. She had come from a socialist family in England, graduated from the London School of Economics, and remained a lifelong friend of pacifist guru and iconic liberal philosopher Bertrand Russell. She had become a Communist, married a Soviet citizen and had lived in the USSR. Regnery stated that she always took the side of the underdog, and that in the immediate post-war world the collective underdog was decidedly the Germans. [35] Moreover, like Gollancz, Utey had drawn from her experiences, having stayed in Germany in 1948. At the time industries were still being dismantled, denazification entailed guilt by association, and arbitrary arrests were still frequent. She interviewed Germans and occupiers, and perused the documentation. Her book was scathingly attacked by a Germanophobe, Delbert Clark, writing for the *Sunday New York Times*. [36]

When Utey was in Germany she was not reticent about condemning U.S. policy to the press and in lectures. Some U.S. media, especially *The Reporter*, which ran several articles on the subject, inferred collusion between the Soviets and American and German Rightists in condemning US occupation policies. This was at a time when the Socialist Reich Party, regarded by the occupation as a revival of the National Socialist party, stated that they did not view Russian occupation as any worse than the

American, that Germany would not align with the USA against the USSR, and the Soviet occupation zone was already taking a more conciliatory approach towards German veterans and the reunification of Germany. Russian émigrés in Germany, neo-Nazis in Germany, McCarthyites in the USA and neo-Nazis in the USA around Frederick Weiss and the National Renaissance Party were portrayed as a common front against the Morgenthau policy, with such supposed anti-Americanism serving the USSR. [37] As we now know, there is reason to believe that many Jews serving as Soviet agents in U.S. Treasury were contriving the Morgenthau policies to push the Germans into the Soviet embrace. [38]

Utley criticized Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's weakness in defending German interests and accused U.S. High Commissioner John J. McCloy of having reinstated on his staff three-fourths of the "Red Morgenthau boys" who had been removed by General Lucius Clay. One of the few German newspapers with the fortitude to support Utley was *Die Deutsche Zukunft*, a Westphalian political weekly owned by Dr. Ernest Achenbach, an Essen lawyer and prominent conservative politician, and leader of the Free Democratic Party in the Ruhr. Achenbach, married to an American, had important contacts in the USA. His friendship with Utley enabled him to keep Senator McCarthy informed on the German situation. [The next issue of *Inconvenient History* is slated to carry a review of *The High Cost of Vengeance*.]

While Achenbach had managed to visit the USA on several occasions, in 1953 Edward Fleckenstein, a New Jersey lawyer of German descent, visited Germany but was promptly deported. Fleckenstein was the president of the Voter's Alliance for Americans of German Descent. H. Keith Thompson was among his colleagues. Indeed, Thompson's Committee for International Justice, and Committee for the Freedom of Major General Remer, were auxiliaries of the Voter's Alliance, and Fleckenstein the legal counsel. While Thompson campaigned for the rights of Germans and for the release of Socialist Reich Party leader Otto Remer from jail, [39] Fleckenstein was a central figure in trying to alleviate the effects of the Morgenthau policy. When Fleckenstein visited Germany in 1953 he lauded Senators McCarthy and Pat McCarran as friends of the German people.

That year a book on the Allied occupation, *Advance to Barbarism*, by English jurist F. J. P. Veale, was published in the USA. It was damned by Jewish sources as an apologia for Nazism. The book had actually been published first in 1948 under a *nom de plume*, "A. Jurist." The 1953 edition carried an enthusiastic endorsement by The Very Reverend Ralph Inge, Dean of St. Paul's. Dean Inge, writing in 1951, presciently wrote of the type of precedents that were being set at Nuremberg:

I disliked the Nuremberg Trials for three reasons: First, trials of the vanquished by the victors are never satisfactory and are generally unfair. Secondly, the execution of the political and military leaders of a beaten side by the victors sets a most dangerous precedent. The Germans were certainly guilty of "crimes against humanity"; but war is not a humane business and it would always be possible for the victors in any way to find enough examples of atrocities to justify vindictive punishments. After the next war, if there is one, trials and hangings will follow as a matter of course. We may go further. One of the indictments of the German leaders was not that they waged war inhumanly, but that they made war aggressively. They did; they desired large annexations of territory in the East. But have we not heard of other nations who have acquired extensive empires without consulting the wishes of the inhabitants? Thirdly, one of the judges—Russia—ought certainly to have been in the dock and not on the bench. [40]

Another "Foreword" was written by the Rt. Hon. Lord Hankey in 1961, who acknowledged Veale's inspiration for his own book, *Politics: Trials and Errors* (1950).

Judge Roden and Senator McCarthy

Among the condemnations of Veale was that he “belittled” “Jewish survivor” testimony on the German manufacture of soap from the fat of exterminated Jews. As is now conceded, the allegation was indeed nonsense. Veale also claimed that the U.S. placed Germans into concentration camps without reason; another allegation by Veale that is now known to be correct. [\[41\]](#)



Sen. Joseph McCarthy with his attorney Roy Cohn during Senate Subcommittee hearings on the McCarthy-Army dispute (1954)

By United Press International telephoto [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons

An article by Milton Friedman of the *Canadian Jewish News* states that one of the two persons to whom Veale dedicated his book was Edward L. Van Roden. Senator McCarthy praised Judge Roden for his exposé of the tortures inflicted on the defendants at the Malmedy Trial in 1949 by U.S. military personnel. Friedman counters that among such personnel were Jews, as though being Jewish per se should have been sufficient to recuse someone from investigation or even criticism. Friedman also alludes to the German defendants as being “Nazi stormtroopers.” Friedman asserts that a Senate Subcommittee found Van Roden’s claims to be “false,” and that there had been a concerted effort to both free the “Nazis” and try the U.S. interrogators. Van Roden, warned Friedman, also endorsed the book *The Crime of Our Age* by Ludwig Fritsch, described as “pro-Nazi, anti-Jewish.” Others who endorsed the book were Dr. A. O. Tittmann, ex-diplomat and founder of the Voters’ Association for Americans of German Descent, which Friedman imaginatively describes as a “successor” to the pre-war, paramilitary, overtly pro-Hitler German-American Bund. Another endorser was long time German-American

campaigner and scholar Dr. Austin J. App,[\[42\]](#) who is singled out for particular condemnation by Lipstadt.[\[43\]](#) Friedman claimed that *The Crime of Our Age* was a “forerunner” to Veale’s book, and circulated mainly in “neo-Nazi” circles, holding that the real “crime” was that the Nazis had lost the war. Veale compares the Morgenthau Plan to the Old Testament, citing “The Book of Joshua.”[\[44\]](#) Hence through such tenuous association the image of a transnational network of neo-Nazis is built up, involving Senator McCarthy, Judge Roden, German-Americans and Nazi apologists. Dean Inge’s endorsement is not mentioned.

Malmedy Trial

Hence the Malmedy Trial, Nuremberg Trials and the Morgenthau Plan were three primary elements of concern for those who opposed Allied post-war policies towards Germany. The Malmedy Trial came under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army.

The 7708th War Crimes Group was established under the command of Colonel Clio E. Straight, an Iowa lawyer and businessman in the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General’s Corps during the war. The purpose of these U.S. Army courts, as distinct from the four-power tribunals, was to investigate alleged war crimes committed against American personnel. From April 1945 to December 1947 these war crimes groups undertook 222 trials. The Army set up an independent reviewing authority, supposedly to provide a fair trial for the defendants. The head of the post-trial section was Samuel Sonenfield, whose name could only have confirmed suspicions as to the provenance of the Allied judicial regime. This U.S. Army group was responsible for the trial of the Malmedy Massacre defendants, from May 16 to July 16, 1946. The defendants had been accused of shooting American soldiers who had surrendered during the Battle of the Bulge, in Belgium. The U.S. Army later investigated the methods of extracting confessions, after a process set in motion by those who convinced Senator McCarthy to take up the cause. A dissertation on the U.S. War Crimes Group, although favorable towards the whole war crimes process, nonetheless states of the defendants that

most were locked in the dungeon of Schwaebisch Hall for months, where they were refused clean clothing or the ability to take a bath. After taking the German prisoners from their dank cells, American interrogators roughly interviewed them and coerced confessions and sworn statements from each using psychological torture, threats and physical violence. Though the SS men were veterans of some of the bitterest fighting in history, most of them were young and did not have the education or experience to withstand the pressure of the investigators.[\[45\]](#)

Willis M. Everett, appointed by the U.S. Army as chief defense counsel, and others, were uneasy about the number of Jews who were involved in the war crimes process. James J. Weingartner writes of this:

Other factors entered into Everett’s refusal to accept the outcome of the Malmedy trial. While not a racist, he shared with many contemporaries a suspicion of Jews as a clannish subculture with views and interests not entirely in harmony with the best interests of the countries of which they were citizens. This manifested itself in a distrustful attitude towards the Jewish principals in the Malmedy investigation and trial, particularly the law member of the court, Colonel Rosenfeld, in the assumption that Germans, SS men at that, could not have received just treatment at their hands. In a nutshell, Everett believed that confessions had been extorted and then legitimated in court by a collusive system which had been weighted against his clients from the beginning.[\[46\]](#)

Everett also considered that the crimes of which the youngsters of the Waffen SS in the heat of battle had been accused, had their counterpart in the U.S. Army. Everett recalled talking with General Josiah Dalbey, president of the Malmedy court, at the officer's club in Dachau one evening. Dalbey stated that the sentencing of the seventy-three defendants had been the most difficult undertaking he had ever encountered because he knew that American soldiers had been guilty of similar offenses. Dalbey agreed with Everett that the case should not have come to trial. The review officer of the Malmedy case, Maximillian Koessler, after the trial, pushed for a speedy review. He referred to convictions, including death and life sentences, as being secured on vague and contradictory testimony, and to interrogation methods that included the use of hoods, false eyewitnesses and mock trials. Col. Straight was displeased with Koessler's reviews (although he could not adequately articulate his reasons), and they were rejected.^[47] Everett took the matter to the U.S. Supreme Court, despite the Army refusing to provide him with the court transcripts of Malmedy. The Supreme Court Justices ruled that they did not have jurisdiction over the Army trials.^[48]

German and American patriots, along with sundry liberals expressing disquiet about the vengeance being wreaked upon Germany, took the matter up with Senator McCarthy, a member of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, pressing for an inquiry.^[49] The secretary of the army, Kenneth C. Royall, established a tribunal headed by Gordon Simpson of the Texas Supreme Court, Leroy van Roden, Pennsylvania judge, and Lieutenant Colonel Charles W. Lawrence of the U.S. Army.^[50] The Simpson Commission recommended the commutation of all death sentences of the Malmedy defendants.^[51] While the Simpson Commission report was "bland," van Roden returned to the USA fully endorsing the allegations that interrogators had subjected the defendants to beatings, including "blows to the genitals," threats of hanging during interrogations, and refusal of drinking water.^[52] Colonel Strong, head of the War Crimes Group at Wiesbaden, testifying before the Senate investigation, was critical of the prejudiced manner of Colonel A. H. Rosenfeld, the "law member" of the court trying the Malmedy defendants, and stated that the prosecution team had obstructed and threatened witnesses.^[53] Rosenfeld "had wielded great power, interpreting the law and making frequent procedural rulings for a bench whose members were combat soldiers inexperienced in such matters. Rosenfeld had not allowed the defense to challenge the credibility of prosecution witnesses."^[54] The most prominent of the interrogators at Schwaebisch Hall was William R. Perl, a Prague-born Jewish lawyer from Austria, who had been active with Zionist emigration programs. He was attached to the War Crimes Branch of the U.S. Army in 1945. When incessantly questioned by Senator McCarthy, Perl "exploded" that there was so much "noise" about "one or two Germans getting slapped."^[55]

It is therefore quite a distortion to place the critique of the Malmedy trial in the context of neo-Nazism joined with McCarthyism, while castigating individuals such as Judge Van Roden as liars. Colonel Everett was at the center of trying to secure justice, and certainly did not do himself any personal favors by advancing the case. Nor did Van Roden. In the mid 1950s he was among the hundreds of prominent people who gave testimonials to H. Keith Thompson for Dönitz. Unlike Jewish interrogators in U.S. Army uniforms, Van Roden had served three years in Europe during the war, including the Normandy D-Day landing. He examined the records of trials in over 1000 cases, undertook many interviews, and concluded that such war crimes trials were a travesty, including that of Malmedy.^[56]

The Malmedy case was typical of the war crimes procedures, as recent disclosures show. A "secret torture prison" was operated at Bad Nenndorf in north-west Germany, by the Combined Services Detailed Interrogation Centre (CSDIC), a division of the British War Office. The center of the township

was emptied of people and surrounded with barbed wire. At night the villagers could hear the screams of the prisoners. Most of the interrogators were “German-Jewish refugees.” The warders were the “most unruly” elements of the British Army, who could be expected to resort most readily to violence.[\[57\]](#)

The Foreign Office briefed Clement Attlee, the prime minister, that “the guards had apparently been instructed to carry out physical assaults on certain prisoners with the object of reducing them to a state of physical collapse and of making them more amenable to interrogation.”[\[58\]](#)

Another “secret center” was operated in London where German POWs could be held and tortured in England without the knowledge of the Red Cross. In 2005, at the request of *The Guardian* newspaper, documents were declassified showing the extent of the torture regime against Germans after the war. The documents refer to “living skeletons,” tortured, beaten and exposed to extreme cold. The ranks of the prisoners expanded from being members of the Nazi party and the SS, to anyone who had succeeded under the Third Reich. They even included Germans who had escaped from the Russian zone and offered to spy for the British: they were tortured – one dying – to determine whether they were sincere. A former diplomat incarcerated at Bad Nenndorf was there simply because he knew too much about the interrogation techniques, while another was there for eight months due to a clerical error. Apart from physical brutalities, threats to kill a prisoner’s wife and children were accepted techniques of interrogation. An anti-Nazi who had spent two years in Gestapo custody stated he had never experienced such brutality as he had at Bad Nenndorf.[\[59\]](#)

This was the *modus operandi* of the Allied occupation forces, exposed by people such as McCarthy, Van Roden, Fleckenstein, Veale, Tittmann, App, et al, in the immediate aftermath of the war, at first vilified but since increasingly vindicated.



AUSTIN J. APP, PH. D.

Austin J. App
The Widmann Collection

The Crime of Our Age

The supposed Nazi apologia circulating mainly within “neo-Nazi” circles according to Milton Friedman, *The Crime of Our Age*, was written by a Lutheran theologian, Dr. Ludwig A. Fritsch, and intended mainly for circulation among Christian laymen and pastors. It had been given to the U. S. President, Washington officials and all Congressmen. It was published in 1947, and hence is one of the first critiques of post-war occupation policy. Fritsch focused on what is now being called “relativism,” in pointing out that whatever the Germans were accused of, the Allies had done similarly during *and after* the war. An example is the accusation of the German looting of art, which is lately receiving fresh attention through the movie, *The Monuments Men*. The Hessian royal jewelry was looted by an American WAC officer, her defense lawyer stating that 90% of the occupation forces had done likewise. The late Kaiser’s silverware was stolen by a colonel who was a lawyer in civilian life. Fritsch “thanked the Lord” that his son, having served as an officer in the U.S. Army, came home stating that he had kept the Seventh Commandment.

So far from *The Crime* being an apologia for Nazism, Fritsch stated that most Germans knew as little about Dachau etc., as Americans knew about what was being done in their name at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Fritsch was not defending Nazism, he was objecting to the defamation and genocide being imposed on Germany in the name of collective guilt, and as a theologian contended that such a policy had more in common with the *Talmud* and Old Testament than with Christianity. Citing Professor Pitrim Sorokin’s *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, Fritsch pointed out that Germany, far from being uniquely a war-mongering nation as claimed by the Germanophobes, spent fewer years engaged in war than any other leading European nation between the 12th century and 1925. Fritsch’s appeal was to clergy, not to “Neo-Nazis” and he appealed to them to “fight for peace in Christ’s name.” [60]

In 1947, the same year as the publication of Fritsch’s book, Ralph Keeling’s *Gruesome Harvest* was published. [61] Dr. Austin J. App, a notable lifelong opponent of Germanophobia, wrote in his introduction to the 1978 edition that Keeling’s book was the first to blast the silence on the expulsion of 15,000,000 ethnic Germans from their homes in East Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia and the Sudetenland to a ruined, starving Germany. The 1947 edition seems to have been funded, according to App, by Arthur Koegel, a conservative German-American, and chairman of Koegel Coal Company. [62] Keeling prefaced his report of the expulsions with a description of the wartime devastation of Germany caused by the firebombing of civilian targets such as Dresden, Frankfurt-on-Main, Hamburg, Kassel, etc. General Eisenhower said his aim was the “destruction of ... every German west of the Rhine and within that area in which we are attacking.” [63]

Keeling saw the post-war annexation of German territory as a means of “extermination by overcrowding,” coupled with the destruction of German industry and the expropriation of resources. When the ethnic Germans in Poland and Czechoslovakia were pushed across to Germany with only what they could carry, millions more were added to the already starving population. *Chicago Daily News* correspondents were told by Russian soldiers that “the Poles had cleaned out all Germans as far west as the Oder River, and the Germans in Sudetenland.” They were permitted to take 30 to 100 pounds of luggage but nothing of value. [64] A train came into Berlin from Poland with 1000 refugees, among whom were 91 dead, some of the women having gone insane, and many trying to carry their

dead babies with them. *New York Daily News* correspondent Donald Mackenie reported from Berlin of 12,000,000 to 19,000,000 displaced refugees in East Prussia and Silesia, and mortality rates of 25% along the roadsides.[\[65\]](#)

While 4,000,000 Germans had fallen as slave laborers into Russian hands, the western Allies were not innocent. According to the International Red Cross, France had 680,000 former German soldiers as slave labor in 1946, most of whom had been turned over as POWs by the U.S. Army. *Figaro* magazine reported that they were “living skeletons,” savagely and systematically beaten.[\[66\]](#) At the same time the Red Cross reported that Britain had 460,000 German slave laborers.[\[67\]](#) Other countries having slave labor were Italy, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Luxembourg, and Holland.[\[68\]](#) While the rapes of German women and girls by the Soviet Army are often commented on, not so well known is the rape perpetrated under the French occupation especially by Moroccan and Senegalese troops. In Vailhingen, a town of 12,000, 500 cases of rape were reported. In the U.S. zone, Captain Frederick B. Eutsler, a chaplain, wrote in *Stars and Stripes* of the barbarous conduct towards women by the U.S. troops. In Stuttgart during the French occupation, 1,198 women were raped and eight men violated mostly by Moroccans. Dr. Karl Hartenstein of the Evangelical church estimated the number of rapes to be 5,000.[\[69\]](#) American troops spread venereal disease along with democracy. V.D. was especially rampant among colored troops, in mid 1946 standing at 771 per thousand in comparison to 190 per thousand among white American troops. According to Lee Hills, *Chicago Daily News* foreign correspondent, there were 42,000 Negro (U.S.) troops stationed in Germany.[\[70\]](#)

Starvation played a major role in the ravishing of German women; hence it could be said that they were not “raped” so much as paying G.I.’s for minimal life sustenance. How much more moral this was than the mass rapes committed by Soviet troops is an elusive point. Observers such as Gollancz and Christian aid workers commented on the widespread starvation. Dr. Lawrence Meyer, Executive Secretary of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, stated in January 1946, after returning from Germany that he expected millions of children to die of starvation. Dorothy Thompson, not noted for her Hitlerism, reported that postwar policies were resulting in the “extermination of tens of thousands of children.”[\[71\]](#) Some politicians exposed the plight of Germany in the USA. Senator Homer E. Capehart, Indiana, stated to the Senate that there was a deliberate policy of mass starvation conceived by a “conspiratorial clique.”[\[72\]](#)

Even during the war, Dr. Austin J. App had begun writing on the folly and barbarity of Allied policies. He is reserved a special place by Lipstadt as seminal in the development of “Holocaust denial.” Lipstadt claims that because App was a lifelong figure in German-American societies he, unlike the eminent American academic revisionist Harry Elmer Barnes, “had no independent standing in the academic world.”[\[73\]](#) App served as president of the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent, founded in 1945. While he was a professor of English literature at Catholic universities, Lipstadt claims that his “far more dubious side” was unknown to his students. Were the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, American Jewish Congress, and American Jewish Committee really so neglectful in trying ruin the career of a well-placed and outspoken critic of Germanophobia and Talmudism, which Lipstadt calls “gutter-level antisemitism”? However, as we are again reminded, the Morgenthau Plan was not in effect anyway, and indeed the U.S. policy was humane.[\[74\]](#)

App began his campaigning in 1942, writing to newspapers, periodicals and journalists. In 1943, after Roosevelt and Churchill had declared at Casablanca that only unconditional surrender was acceptable,

App wrote to the *Columbus Evening Dispatch* that the concept was “grossly unethical.” The view was one shared widely among Allied military leaders and judicial scholars, as Thompson’s compilation for Dönitz would show. App visited Germany in 1949, noting the large numbers of Jews engaging in black-marketeering and theft, and seemingly immune from the law. Germanophobes see this as nothing other than App’s “gutter-level anti-Semitism.” However, the Eastern Jews had been widely held in contempt even by German Jewry before the war, who often expressed their disgust in a manner similar to that of App. For example, Walther Rathenau, foreign minister in Weimar Germany, wrote of them “You rarely find a middle course between wheedling subservience and vile arrogance.” Rathenau hoped that German Jews would develop as something quite different from the types that were coming from the East. [75]

General George S. Patton, placed in charge of Displaced Persons, restricted the movements only of Jews, due to their habits. For this he was reprimanded by Eisenhower, and shortly after removed as commander of the Third Army, and he subsequently died in dubious circumstances. Patton attested to the Morgenthau Plan being implemented and remarked:

Evidently the virus started by Morgenthau and Baruch of a Semitic revenge against all Germans is still working. Harrison (a U.S. State Department official) and his associates indicate that they feel German civilians should be removed from houses for the purpose of housing Displaced Persons. There are two errors in this assumption. First, when we remove an individual German we punish an individual German, while the punishment is not intended for the individual but for the race.

Furthermore, it is against my Anglo-Saxon conscience to remove a person from a house, which is a punishment, without due process of law. In the second place, Harrison and his ilk believe that the Displaced Person is a human being, which he is not, and this applies particularly to the Jews, who are lower than animals.” [76]

In 1946 App published *Ravishing the Women of Conquered Europe*, focusing on the orgy of rape perpetrated by the Allied armies. App published his letters to the press from the latter half of the 1940s as *Morgenthau Era Letters* in 1949.

App was not motivated by Nazism or anti-Semitism but by his devotion to Catholicism, like the Lutheran motivation evident in Fritsch’s *Crime of Our Age*. The Germanophobes and Talmudists are perhaps constitutionally incapable of appreciating this or of even differentiating between Christian apologia and Hitlerite apologia. App is recognized as a notable Catholic scholar, educator and author. He wrote of his motivations in five principles:

1. that Christianity, especially Catholic Christianity, should be accepted all over the world as life's first and greatest blessing;
2. that literature is the best engine for carrying the ideals of Christianity from the heads of men to their hearts;
3. that profane and indecent speech, along with the greater sins of violence, immorality, and dishonesty, must be vigorously repressed;
4. that world peace is God's reward for justice and that enforcing an unjust peace is a criminal responsibility;

5. and that, to advance Christian ideals, good people must not only become informed but must also be trained to express themselves persuasively. [\[77\]](#)

App explained:

...Most compellingly, I saw with horror that the Yalta and Potsdam pacts were delivering much of Christian Europe to the Bolsheviks, who were looting, killing, and ravishing their way into Eastern Germany, Austria, and Hungary. With the approval of American leftists and Morgenthauists, the Communists and Partisans were expelling twelve million ethnic Germans from their ancient homelands, which "forced migration of millions of people," another former professor of mine, now Archbishop Aloisius J. Muench, called "the greatest crime of this age."

When even many Catholic magazines feared to publish the painful truth about Morgenthauism and the Potsdam peace, I felt forced, no matter what the cost, to publish myself. Beginning with a reprint from the Brooklyn Tablet entitled "Propaganda 'To Hate All Germans' Is Debunked" (Feb. 16, 1946) by an army officer, upon which as a lucky afterthought I set a price, "One copy, a stamp; ten, 25 cents," I wrote and published in the next five months: "Ravishing the Women of Conquered Europe"; "The Big Three Deportation Crime"; and "Slave-laboring German Prisoners of War." I was overwhelmed by the response. With one swoop my ivory-tower teaching status was ended. Morgenthauistic attacks, angry letters, thank you and help-seeking letters literally by the thousands, and orders, also by the thousands, flooded into my apartment. In a matter of months several of the pamphlets were out of print at 30,000 copies; one went to 80,000 in English and was translated into four foreign languages. [\[78\]](#)

What is less known about App is that he also authored many works on his scholarly specialty, English literature, and received awards as an educator. Establishing Boniface Press in December 1946, he first published *History's Most Terrifying Peace*, a collection of thirteen articles. The theme is on the un-Christian concept of unconditional war, and the Catholic attitude that negotiation with the enemy should be the first principle of just war. [\[79\]](#)

Relief Aid

While such courageous individuals had from the start raised their voices against the genocidal Germanophobia of Allied war and post-War policies, there were also immediate post-War practical efforts to try and alleviate the sufferings caused by the Morgenthau occupation regime. In particular, food relief was organized by German-American societies with the aid of Christian relief organizations, in particular the Quakers. At the center of these efforts were Edward Fleckenstein and Dr. A. O. Tittmann.

In 1947 the Senate Committee on Civil Service under the chairmanship of William Langer heard submissions "To Amend the Trading with the Enemy Act So as to Permit Certain Aid to Civilian Recovery in Occupied Zones." The terms read:

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, it shall be lawful, at any time after the date of cessation of hostilities with any country with which the United States is at war, for any person in the United States (1) to donate, or otherwise dispose of to, and to transport or deliver to, any person in such country any article or articles (including food, clothing, and medicine) intended to be used solely to relieve human suffering, and any article or articles intended for household or other personal use or for sustenance of life; and (2) to donate money not exceeding \$100 in any calendar month to any one person, or to any two or more persons in the same immediate family, in such country, and to transmit

such money to such person or persons by international money order or other appropriate means, and the Post Office Department is authorized and directed to accept and transmit any such money order. [80]

The Senators were incredulous that while the Chase Manhattan Bank had established a branch in Germany and had been authorized to accept international remittances, the U.S. Post Office Department could not do so. It is of interest that Senator Langer, chairman of the proceedings, was to write to H. Keith Thompson a testimonial for Dönitz, stating that his conviction at Nuremberg had been a “travesty.” [81] Tittmann cited Quaker reports that Germans were living off potatoes, and soup from any vegetable that they might eke out of a flowerpot or window box. [82] He referred to the 15,000,000 ethnic expellees. James M. Read of the Quaker organization, American Friends Committee on National Legislation, stated that he had been to Germany for the Relief Council of the American Friends Service Committee, working with Protestant and Catholic organizations. He said that “the suffering in Germany cannot be exaggerated.” [83] Edward Fleckenstein spoke as chairman of an aid committee of clergymen and laymen in New Jersey. They attempted to help individual families who appealed for assistance. Because of weight regulations in postage little food was able to be shipped. [84] Walter Penningsdorf of the Steuben Society also testified as to the difficulties of getting aid to Germany due to postal restrictions. [85]

Keith Thompson recalled that Fleckenstein’s work had “paved the way” for the removal of restrictions on sending aid to Germany. He had been assisted by former New Jersey Governor Driscoll, “ministers, teachers and businessmen.” In 1950 Fleckenstein participated in “a trial-blazing Dismantling Suit” against Secretary of State Dean Acheson, seeking damages for German industries dismantled by the U.S. occupation regime as part of the Morgenthau process. [86] Fleckenstein held various meetings for German-American friendship in 1950, particularly in Yorkville, a German enclave in New York City. He was backed by Frederick C. F. Weiss, a mentor for many nationalist causes and individuals, including particularly Thompson and Francis Parker Yockey; Kurt Mertig, a German-American activist since before the war, and president of the Citizens Protective League; and A. O. Tittmann. [87]

Fleckenstein became legal counsel for Thompson’s Committee for the Freedom of Major General Remer in 1952 when the latter was incarcerated in Germany as a leader of the burgeoning Socialist Reich Party, which had been banned, and of which Thompson had been registered U.S. agent. Fleckenstein also served as counsel for the Committee for International Justice, another Thompson effort that campaigned with some success to assist incarcerated German war veterans. [88] Both committees were auxiliaries of the Voters Association for Americans of German Ancestry, of which Fleckenstein was president. [89] He had been invited by Dr. Aschenhauer, who had been a defense counsel at the Nuremberg Trials, and had been influential in conservative circles in the Free Democratic Party, to tour Germany in 1953. That year Fleckenstein did go to Germany, where he lectured but was quickly expelled. [90] Fleckenstein had organized a “German-American friendship rally,” in which Senator Joseph McCarthy had been due to speak, but McCarthy decided on another engagement. However, those who did speak apart from Fleckenstein, were Henry C. Furstenwalde, former official at the U.S. embassy in Berlin; Austin J. App of LaSalle College; Dr. Ludwig Fritsch; and Father Emmanuel J. Reichenberger, “distinguished Catholic expert on the East German expellee problem.” Keith Thompson served as “floor manager.” He recalled that it was “the first time since World War II that such an audience had been assembled.” [91] Father Reichenberger, far from being a “Nazi,” had opposed the local Hitlerites in his native Sudetenland before the war and had been known for his left-wing sympathies. After the 1938 Munich Agreement he fled Czechoslovakia, reaching the USA in 1940. Travelling back to Czechoslovakia

with the U.S. Army in 1945, he noted the brutality of the Czech army towards ethnic Germans. He became the advocate of the millions of German ethnic expellees from the east. For this work he was criticized as an apologist for Nazism. His books included *East German Passion* (1948), *Drive through Defeated Country* (1950), *Europe in Ruins: The Result of the Crusade of the Allies* (1952) and others.

Fleckenstein was reported as also being prominent in the Pastorius Society and the Steuben Society, two long established German-American associations.^[92] Fleckenstein was also “well-known” for his campaign work for the Republican presidential nomination of Robert Taft, a veteran America Firster, against Eisenhower.^[93] Thompson organized a front for this called the American Voters’ Association. Included in the pro-Taft campaign at the Republican national convention in Chicago, along with Fleckenstein and Thompson, was Arthur Koegel, German-American businessman,^[94] who during the early 1960s became president of the Steuben Society. There they lobbied for friendship with Germany, meeting Senators Dirksen and McCarthy; former Congressman Hamilton Fish, a veteran America Firster; and conservative columnist Westbrook Pegler.

While the FBI monitored Fleckenstein, Thompson et al, “Postwar American Jewish Community groups paid close attention to the activities of German American groups, seeing them as defenders of Nazism and supporters of Hitler’s memory. Jewish publications and defense organizations paid close attention to the ‘old pro-German groups’ that functioned in the post-war period ‘under the guise of German relief societies.’” *The American Jewish Year Book*, Jewish community councils, the American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League “ferreted out” and “gave particular attention to the ‘German Groups,’ which they considered a category unto themselves,” in regard to monitoring “anti-Semitism.” *The American Jewish Year Book* for 1950 included a chapter entitled “Anti-Jewish Agitation” in reporting on the “German Groups,” where there was any manifestation of activity by Tittmann’s Voters’ Alliance for Americans of German Ancestry.^[95] Organized Jewry in the USA was determined to maintain the Germanophobia of wartime, and thereby gave support to the implementation of the Morgenthau outlook. They worked to abort any effort for American and German reconciliation. Ten years after the war Organized Jewry was agitating against the performance of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra under Herbert von Karajan, whom the Jewish Labor Committee called “a notorious Nazi.” The *Boston Jewish Times* commented that had Hitler won the war, the same orchestra and conductor would be playing in the USA with the Horst Wessel Song among its repertoire.^[96] In Cincinnati, where the population of German descent was large, the Jewish Community Relations Committee agitated against the plan to make Munich a “sister city.”^[97]

With the perpetuation of such Germanophobia, still going strong ten years after the war, it is easy to understand why Senator McCarthy would have been blacklisted among organized Jewry even prior to his crusade against communist infiltration, which happened to turn up mainly those of Jewish descent. These included the coteries led by Nathan Gregory Silvermaster and Victor Perlo operating mainly within the Treasury Department, formulating post-war policies on Germany. Others included Silvermaster’s wife Helen, Solomon Adler, Frank Coe, who ended up as an adviser in Red China; Bela Gold; Sonia Gold; Irving Kaplan, who served as chief adviser to the U.S. military government in Germany; George Silverman; William Ullmann, and Harry Dexter White. With 80% of the Soviet agents turning up as Jews, Germanophobia served as a red herring, albeit one that had little effect among the American population when McCarthy started his investigations. Such Jews had a schizoid frame of mind, insofar as many remained loyal to Stalin due to their hatred of Western civilization, regardless of their traditional distrust of Russians and Stalin’s own vigorous turn against “rootless cosmopolitans” (Jews) after the world war.

Eventually, the Cold War obliged the USA to incorporate Germany into its alliance against the USSR despite the reluctance of many Germans who had no wish to serve their new supposed “friend” that had spent so many years seeking their literal destruction.

Notes:

- [1] For example, Stalin insisted to the German Communist leadership, or what was left of them (most having been liquidated by their Russian comrades when they sought refuge from Hitler) that they accept veterans from the Third Reich into the political and military apparatus. Stalin offered German reunification, repudiated Jewish reparations claims, and formed a nationalist party, the National Democratic Party of Germany, which remained an important constituent of the East German government. See Bolton, “Stalin’s German-Nationalist Party,” *Inconvenient History*, http://inconvenienthistory.com/archive/2014/volume_6/number_1/stalins_german_nationalist_party.php
- [2] Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust* (London: Penguin, 1993), p. 44.
- [3] K. R. Bolton, “Profiles in History: H. Keith Thompson Jr.,” *Inconvenient History*, http://inconvenienthistory.com/archive/2014/volume_6/number_2/h_keith_thompson_jr.php
- [4] H. K. Thompson Jr., and Henry Strutz, *Doenitz at Nuremberg: A Reappraisal: War Crimes and the Military Professional* (New York: Amber Publishing, 1976), xviii.
- [5] H. K. Thompson Jr., and Henry Strutz, *ibid.*, xx.
- [6] Gallery, *ibid.*, xxi.
- [7] Gallery, *ibid.*, xxii.
- [8] It was noted in 1975 that even the New Left, in its opposition to American interventionism, was turning to the example of Taft. While interventionism is regarded as a “conservative” policy, conservatism having over the past few decades been hijacked by ex-Trotskyites calling themselves “neoconservatives,” the genuine “paleoconservative” position of non-interventionism is upheld by Pat Buchanan, Paul Gottfried, et al. In contrast to the Trotskyites and other socialists who flocked to the Cold War bandwagon against the USSR, Taft, despite his anti-Communist conservatism, maintained his non-interventionist stance and opposed confrontation with Russia. See Robert McTiernan, “Taft and the New Isolationism,” *The Alternative: An American Spectator*, October 1975, <http://64.62.200.70/PERIODICAL/PDF/AmSpectator-1975oct/16-19/>
Also: Michael McMenamin, “Anticommunist? Yes. Cold Warrior? No,” *Reason*, July, 1979, <http://64.62.200.70/PERIODICAL/PDF/Reason-1979jul/34-41/>

- [9] John F. Kennedy, *Profiles in Courage* (Harper and Row, 1956), cited in Thompson, op. cit., xxvii.
- [10] Thompson, op. cit., p. 4.
- [11] Ibid., p. 5.
- [12] Ibid., p. 23.
- [13] Lipstadt, op. cit., p. 44.
- [14] Baruch regarded the Morgenthau Plan as “much too soft.” Of the U.S. State Department representative, Clayton, who was opposing the Morgenthau Plan, Baruch said he would “cut his heart out if he didn’t behave himself.” He added of Clayton: “He won’t be able to stay around Washington after I get through with him.” Quoted by Kubek, op. cit., p. 67; de Poncins, p. 123.
- [15] *Morgenthau Diary* (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1967). On this see Count Leon de Poncins, *State Secrets: A Documentation of the Secret Revolutionary Mainspring Governing Anglo-American Politics* (Devon: Britons Publishing Co. 1975), pp. 95-138.
- [16] James Bacque, *Crimes and Mercies* (London: Little Brown & Co., 1997).
- [17] Bolton, “Historical Revisionism and ‘Relativizing the Holocaust,’” *Inconvenient History*, http://inconvenienthistory.com/archive/2012/volume_4/number_2/historical_revisionism_and_relativising_the_holocaust.php
- [18] Lipstadt, op. cit., p. 40.
- [19] Ibid., p. 37.
- [20] Ibid., p. 44.
- [21] Nahum Goldmann, *Memories*, pp. 216-217; quoted by Count Leon de Poncins, op. cit., pp. 50-51.
- [22] Ibid.
- [23] Ibid.
- [24] Lipstadt, op.cit., p. 44; endnote 56 to “The Antecedents.”
- [25] Henry Regnery, *Memoirs of a Dissident Publisher* (Lake Bluff, Ill.: Regnery Books, 1985), p. 32.
- [26] Ibid., p. 33.
- [27] Ibid., pp. 37-38.

- [28] Ibid., p. 39.
- [29] Ibid., p. 40.
- [30] Ibid., p. 44.
- [31] Ibid., p. 46.
- [32] Ibid., p. 48.
- [33] Freda Utey, *The High Cost of Vengeance* (Chicago: Regnery, 1949), p. 14.
- [34] Lipstadt, op. cit., p. 43.
- [35] Regnery, op. cit., p. 49.
- [36] Ibid., p. 51.
- [37] Edmond Taylor, "Germany: Where Fascism and Communism Meet," *The Reporter*, April 13, 1954, p. 10.
- [38] Soviet infiltration with centered in the Treasury Department, through the Silvermaster and Perlo spy rings. See concluding paragraph herein.
- [39] K R Bolton, "Thompson," op. cit.
- [40] Ralph Inge, Foreword, Veale, *Advance to Barbarism*, 1953. The book is online at: [http://www.jrbooksonline.com/HTML-docs/Advance to Barbarism.htm#_ftn1](http://www.jrbooksonline.com/HTML-docs/Advance_to_Barbarism.htm#_ftn1)
- [41] James Bacque, *Other Losses* (Toronto: Stoddard, 1989).
- [42] Milton Friedman, "Heard in the Lobbies," *Canadian Jewish News*, January 22, 1954.
- [43] Lipstadt, op. cit., pp. 85-102.
- [44] Milton Friedman, op. cit.
- [45] Reynolds and Mueller, "Review, U.S. v. Altfuldisch, et al," 1-2, Office of the Judge Advocate, *Complete List of War Crimes Case Trials*, 49-53; cited by Wesley Vincent Hilton, "The Blackest Canvas: U.S. Army Courts and the Trials of War Criminals in Post World War II Europe," Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas Tech University, December 2003, p. 138.
- [46] James J. Weingartner, *Crossroads of Death: the Story of the Malmedy Massacre and Trial*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979, p. 169.
- [47] Ibid., pp. 170-172.
- [48] Ibid., p. 187.

- [49] Ibid., p. 199.
- [50] Ibid., p. 190.
- [51] Ibid., p. 193.
- [52] Ibid., p. 194.
- [53] Ibid., p. 209.
- [54] Ibid., p. 225.
- [55] Ibid., p. 218-219.
- [56] Edward L. Van Roden in *Doenitz...*, op, cit., p. 67.
- [57] Ian Cobain, "Britain's Secret Torture Chamber: The Interrogation Centre that Turned Prisoners into Living Skeletons," *The Guardian*, December 17, 2005, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/dec/17/secondworldwar.topstories3?gu=Article:in%20body%20link>
- [58] Ibid.
- [59] Ibid.
- [60] Ludwig A. Fritsch, *The Crime of Our Age* (Chicago, 1947), <http://www.germanvictims.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/crime-of-our-age-ludwig-adolphus-fritsch.pdf>
- [61] Ralph Keeling, *Gruesome Harvest: The Costly Attempt to Exterminate the People of Germany* (Chicago: Institute of American Economics, 1947).
- [62] Keeling, *Gruesome Harvest* (Reedy, W. Va., 1978).
- [63] Ibid., p. 3.
- [64] Ibid., p. 14.
- [65] Ibid., p. 15.
- [66] Ibid., p. 21.
- [67] Ibid., p. 23.
- [68] Ibid., p. 25.
- [69] Ibid., p. 57.
- [70] Ibid., pp. 58-59.

- [71] Ibid., pp. 67-68.
- [72] Ibid., p. 70.
- [73] Lipstadt, op. cit., p. 85.
- [74] Ibid., p. 86.
- [75] Walter Rathenau, "Hear, O Israel!," *Zukunft*, no. 18, March 16, 1897.
- [76] George Patton, diary entry September 17, 1945.
- [77] "Austin Joseph App," Catholic Authors, <http://www.catholicauthors.com/app.html>
- [78] Ibid.
- [79] App, *History's Most Terrifying Peace* (Takoma Park, Md.: Boniface Press, May 1970).
- [80] Senate Committee on Civil Service, "To Amend the Trading with the Enemy Act So as to Permit Certain Aid to Civilian Recovery in Occupied Zones," Washington D.C., April, June, 1947.
- [81] Thompson, *Doenitz at Nuremberg*, op. cit., p. 5.
- [82] Tittmann before Langer committee, op. cit., p. 18.
- [83] Read before Langer, ibid., p. 19.
- [84] Fleckenstein before Langer, ibid., p. 22.
- [85] Penningsdorf before Langer, ibid., p. 23.
- [86] H. K. Thompson, "I Am an American Fascist," Part II, *Expose*, September 1954.
- [87] Ibid.
- [88] Bolton, "Thompson...," *Inconvenient History*, op. cit.
- [89] Brian F. Jinnett Jr., FBI, Newark, NK 105-919, October 9, 1952, p. 2.
- [90] FBI Memo, New York, 105-6127, October 14, 1953, p. 2.
- [91] H. K. Thompson, "I Am an American Fascist," op. cit.
- [92] Brian F. Jinnett Jr., FBI, ibid., p. 9.
- [93] FBI Memorandum, Newark 105-1160, August 4, 1953, p. 4.
- [94] FBI Memorandum, August 4, 1953, ibid., p. 15.

- [95] Hasia R. Diner, *We Remember with Reverence and Love: American Jews and the Myth of Silence after the Holocaust 1945-1962* (New York University Press, 2009), p. 243.
- [96] *Ibid.*, pp. 242-243.
- [97] *Ibid.*, p. 244.

Author(s):	Kerry R. Bolton
Title:	Defending the Defenseless
Sources:	<i>Inconvenient History</i> , 7(1) 2015
Dates:	published: 2015-03-10, first posted: 2015-03-10 00:00:00

<http://inconvenienthistory.com/7/1/3359>